

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-9, 11-14, 17-19 and 21-22 are pending. Claims 1, 4, 7 and 11 have been amended. Claims 2, 3, 10, 15, 16 and 20 have been canceled. Claim 22 has been added. Applicant requests reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shibata et al. (Japanese Laid-Open Application 11-120919, hereinafter Shibata). Applicant overcomes the rejections as follows.

Claim 1 sets forth, *inter alia*, “a plurality of fourth electrodes are fixed to the barrier ribs in such a manner as to be inserted in the barrier ribs at a first distance from the first substrate.” Applicant could find no teaching or suggestion in Shibata disclosing a fourth electrode “inserted in the barrier ribs at a first distance from the first substrate.”

In accordance with Claim 1, the distance between the fourth electrode and the first substrate may be varied. When the fourth electrode is “fixed to the barrier ribs in such a manner as to be inserted in the barrier ribs at a first distance from the first substrate,” there is no fourth electrode on top of the barrier ribs so that the first substrate faces the top surface of the barrier ribs which can be molded flexibly. Since the forth electrodes are fixed to the barrier ribs in such a manner as to be inserted in the barrier ribs at a first distance from the first substrate, the fourth electrodes can be fixed to any position between the top part and the bottom part, but not on the top part or the bottom part.

Advantageously, the invention set forth in Claim 1 makes it possible not only to prevent cross talk in the same manner as in the case where the fourth electrodes are formed on the top part of the barrier ribs, but also to stabilize the address discharges at the same time.

In contrast, Shibata discloses that a conductive material 9m, 9n, 9o is applied onto the top part of the barrier ribs (Shibata, ¶ [0024], FIGS. 3 and 4). Shibata does not disclose or recognize the necessity for cross talk prevention and stabilizing the address discharges at the same time. Therefore, Shibata does not teach or suggest changing the position of the fourth electrode “to be inserted in the barrier ribs at a first distance from the first substrate,” which places the fourth electrodes nearer to the address electrodes. Thus, the disclosure in Shibata does not anticipate a structure that can realize the prevention of cross talk and the stabilization of the address discharges at the same time as set forth in Claim 1.

Accordingly, since Shibata does not teach or suggest the features of Claim 1, Claim 1 is not anticipated by Shibata and is allowable over the reference.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 5, 6 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shibata in view of the Yoshida et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,489,722, herein after Yoshida). Claims 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shibata in view of in view of the Sato et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,423,356, hereinafter Sato). Claims 13-14 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shibata in view of Sato and further in view of Yoshida. Applicant overcomes the rejections as follows.

Claim 7 sets forth, *inter alia*, “a plurality of fourth electrodes are inserted in the barrier ribs so as to be at least in vicinities of areas between adjacent display electrodes.” For reasons stated above regarding Claim 1, Applicant could find no teaching or suggestion in Shibata disclosing a fourth electrode “inserted in the barrier ribs” so as to be at least in vicinities of areas between adjacent display electrodes.

The Applicant has reviewed Sato and Yoshida and has determined that neither reference cures the deficiencies of the Shibata reference to render Claim 7 obvious, since neither reference discloses “a plurality of fourth electrodes are inserted in the barrier ribs.”

Accordingly, Shibata alone or in combination with Sato or Yoshida does not render Claim 7 obvious, and thus, Claim 7 is allowable over the cited references.

Dependent Claims

Claims 4-6, 17 and 22 depend from Claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1 as well as for the novel features which they add. Claims 8, 9, 11-14, 18, 19 and 21 depend from Claim 7 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 7 as well as for the novel features which they add.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that Claims 1, 4-9, 11-14, 17-19 and 21-22 are in condition for allowance and allowance of the claims is hereby solicited. If the Examiner believes a telephone interview will assist in the prosecution of this matter, the undersigned attorney can be contacted at the listed phone number.

Very truly yours,

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.



Theodore P. Lopez
Registration No. 44,881
600 Anton Boulevard, Suite 1400
Costa Mesa, California 92626-7689
Telephone: (714) 427-7413
Facsimile: (714) 427-7799